



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

July 13, 2004

Ms. Angela K. Washington  
Cowles & Thompson  
901 Main Street, Suite 4000  
Dallas, Texas 75202-3793

OR2004-5759

Dear Ms. Washington:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 205107.

The City of Addison (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for the disciplinary records of an identified police officer. You claim that some of the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.108, 552.111, 552.117 and 552.130 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.102 excepts from disclosure "information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy." Gov't Code § 552.102(a). In *Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Texas Newspapers*, 652 S.W.2d 546 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, writ ref'd n.r.e.), the court ruled that the test to be applied to information claimed to be protected under section 552.102 is the same as the test formulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* for information claimed to be protected under the doctrine of common-law privacy as incorporated by section 552.101. See *Industrial Found.*

---

<sup>1</sup> We note that the city did not raise sections 552.117 and 552.130 until more than ten business days after receiving the request for information, thus failing to comply with section 552.301(b) in raising these two exceptions. Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the requested information is public and must be released unless the governmental body demonstrates a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. As sections 552.117 and 552.130 provide compelling reasons to overcome the presumption of openness, we will address the entirety of the city's arguments.

*v. Texas Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 683-85 (Tex. 1976), *cert. denied*, 430 U.S. 931 (1977). Accordingly, we will consider your section 552.101 and section 552.102 claims together.

Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” For information to be protected from public disclosure by the common law right of privacy under section 552.101, the information must meet the criteria set out in *Industrial Foundation*. In *Industrial Foundation*, the Texas Supreme Court stated that information is excepted from disclosure if (1) the information contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts the release of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) the information is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Id.* at 685. The type of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* included information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in the workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs. 540 S.W.2d at 683.

In this instance, the information at issue involves the disciplinary records of a city police officer, which we conclude is of legitimate concern to the public. *See* Open Records Decision No. 438 (1986); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 484 (1987) (public interest in knowing how police departments resolve complaints against police officer ordinarily outweighs the officer’s privacy interest), 444 (1986) (concluding that public has obvious interest in having access to information concerning performances of governmental employees, particularly employees who hold positions as sensitive as those held by members of law enforcement), 423 at 2 (1984) (scope of public employee privacy is narrow), 405 at 2-3 (1983) (public has interest in workplace conduct of public employee), 329 at 2 (1982) (information relating to complaints against public employees and discipline resulting therefrom not protected under statutory predecessor to section 552.101), 208 at 2 (1978) (information relating to complaint against public employee and disposition of the complaint is not protected under either the constitutional or common law right of privacy). Within the disciplinary records of the police officer is medical information, as well as information that identifies a victim of an alleged sexual assault. This information is protected by privacy and must be withheld under section 552.101. None of the remaining submitted information is protected by privacy.

You also contend that some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code. Section 552.108(a)(2) excepts from disclosure information concerning an investigation that concluded in a result other than conviction or deferred adjudication. A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(2) must demonstrate that the requested information relates to a *criminal investigation* that has concluded in a final result other than a conviction or deferred adjudication. Section 552.108 is generally not applicable to the records of an internal affairs investigation that is purely administrative in nature. *See City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320 (Tex. App.—

Austin 2002, no pet.), *Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519, 525-26 (Tex. Civ. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied) (statutory predecessor not applicable to internal investigation that did not result in criminal investigation or prosecution); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 562 at 10 (1990) (predecessor to section 552.108(b) inapplicable to employment information in police officer's file), 361 at 2-3 (1983) (statutory predecessor to section 552.108(b) inapplicable to background information collected on unsuccessful applicant for employment with sheriff's department), 350 at 3-4 (1982). You do not inform us, and the submitted information does not otherwise indicate, that the internal investigations to which the information at issue relates have resulted in any criminal investigations or charges. We therefore conclude that the city has not demonstrated that the information at issue is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108, and none of the submitted information may be withheld on that basis.

You also claim that some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.111 of the Government Code. Section 552.111 excepts from disclosure "an interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency." In Open Records Decision No. 615 (1993), this office reexamined the predecessor to the section 552.111 exception in light of the decision in *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ), and held that section 552.111 excepts only those internal communications consisting of advice, recommendations, opinions, and other material reflecting the policymaking processes of the governmental body. *City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351, 364 (Tex. 2000); *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Texas Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no pet.). An agency's policymaking functions do not encompass internal administrative or personnel matters; disclosure of information relating to such matters will not inhibit free discussion among agency personnel as to policy issues. ORD 615 at 5-6. Additionally, section 552.111 does not generally except from disclosure purely factual information that is severable from the opinion portions of internal memoranda. *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 37 S.W.3d at 160; ORD 615 at 4-5. In this instance, we conclude that the submitted information does not include "intraagency communications consisting of advice, opinion, or recommendations on policymaking matters," but instead concerns internal administrative or personnel matters. Therefore, the city may not withhold any information under section 552.111.

We next address your claim that some of the submitted information may be excepted from disclosure under section 552.117 of the Government Code. Section 552.117(a)(2) excepts from public disclosure a peace officer's home address and telephone number, social security number, and family member information regardless of whether the peace officer made an election under section 552.024 of the Government Code. Section 552.117(a)(2) applies to peace officers as defined by article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. You state that the officer whose disciplinary records are the subject of this request is a peace officer under article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. Based on this assertion, the city must

withhold the information we have marked within the submitted documentation, as well as the same types of information on the submitted audiotapes, under section 552.117(a)(2).

The submitted information also contains social security numbers of individuals outside the scope of section 552.117. These social security numbers may also be excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 in conjunction with the 1990 amendments to the federal Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. § 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I). *See* Open Records Decision No. 622 (1994). These amendments make confidential social security numbers and related records that are obtained and maintained by a state agency or political subdivision of the state pursuant to any provision of law enacted on or after October 1, 1990. *See id.* We have no basis for concluding that the social security number in the file is confidential under section 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I), and therefore excepted from public disclosure under section 552.101 on the basis of that federal provision. We caution, however, that section 552.352 of the Public Information Act imposes criminal penalties for the release of confidential information. Prior to releasing any social security number information, you should ensure that no such information was obtained or is maintained by the city pursuant to any provision of law, enacted on or after October 1, 1990.

Lastly, you claim that some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.130 of the Government Code. Section 552.130 provides, in relevant part:

(a) Information is excepted from the requirement of Section 552.021 if the information relates to:

- (1) a motor vehicle operator's or driver's license or permit issued by an agency of this state; [or]
- (2) a motor vehicle title or registration issued by an agency of this state[.]

Therefore, you must also withhold the Texas driver's license numbers license plate numbers and vehicle identification numbers we have marked within the submitted documentation, as well as the same types of information on the submitted audiotapes, under section 552.130.

In summary, the city must withhold information we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with common law privacy. The city must withhold information under section 552.117 whether marked within the submitted documentation or recorded on the submitted audiotapes. The social security numbers of individuals not subject to section 552.117 may be excepted under section 552.101 in conjunction with federal law. The city must withhold information under section 552.130 whether marked within the submitted documentation or recorded on the submitted audiotapes. In the event that the city does not have the technological ability to remove information from the submitted audiotapes, these recordings

must be withheld in their entirety to protect the information subject to sections 552.117 and 552.130. All remaining information must be released.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).


If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this

ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Marc A. Barenblat  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

MAB/jh

Ref: ID# 205107

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Cheryl Anderson  
Christopher N. Hoover, P.C.  
520 Central Parkway East, Suite 112  
Plano, Texas 75074  
(w/o enclosures)